



US 20 Galena Bypass
Citizen's Advisory Group



MEETING MINUTES

Date: March 9, 2006

Date of Meeting: March 2, 2006

Meeting Place: DeSoto House Hotel, Galena, IL

Project: US 20 (FAP 301) Galena Bypass
IDOT Job No. D-92-025-04
Teng Project No. 02-3460-01

Subject: March 2, 2006 Citizen's Advisory
Group (C.A.G.) Meeting

PARTICIPANTS:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION/ AFFILIATION</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
Steve Robery	IDOT Dist 2	Dixon
Jon McCormick	IDOT Dist 2	Dixon
Mark Nardini	IDOT Dist 2	Dixon
Cassandra Rodgers	IDOT Dist 2	Dixon
Beth Baranski		Galena
Tim Berning		Galena
James Boho		Galena
Mary Ellen Boho		Galena
John J. Cox		Galena
Ed Du Plessis		Galena
Charles Fach		Galena
Bill Fawell		Galena
Sophie Fielder		Galena
Melvin E. Gratton		Galena
Frank Gruber		Chicago
Terrence N. Ingram		Apple River
Robert J. Johnson		Galena
Steve Keeffer		Elizabeth
Chris Kirkpatrick		Elizabeth
David R. Kriesant		Galena
Carol Mantey		Galena
Bill Nybo		Galena

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION/ AFFILIATION</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
Duane Olivier		Galena
Charles Pedersen		Homewood
Pete Peterson		Galena
Jim Rachuy		Stockton
Valerie Stabenow		Freeport
Tom Werner		Galena
Joe Hoerner	Teng and Associates, Inc	Chicago
Mark Dvorak	Teng and Associates, Inc	Chicago
Robert J. Stankiewicz	Teng and Associates , Inc	Chicago

This meeting was held to approve last month's Citizen's Advisory Group (C.A.G.) Meeting Minutes, demonstrate the newly developed *C.A.G. Forum*, answer posted questions on the U.S. 20 preferred profile design, interchange configuration for Horseshoe Mound and interchange configuration for North IL-84, and to continue the discussion regarding C.A.G. organization, leadership, meeting frequency, and future topics. The following is the summary of items discussed and conclusions reached:

1. Introductions / Roll Call

The meeting began with a roll call of all the C.A.G. attendees present at 6:00 p.m.

2. Discussion / Acceptance of 2/7/2006 C.A.G. Minutes

The discussion began with the topic of Bypass Project/C.A.G. press releases and the method and/or scheduling of delivering the information found therein.

- Press releases would not be a separate item; rather an announcement would be crafted in conjunction with the Public Meeting notice. This notice would include a description of the project as well as contain information about the C.A.G and its functions. The meeting notice would be posted on the project website.
- According to standard IDOT procedures, the public notice would be published two times within the 2 weeks prior to the Public Meeting.
- The extensive mailing list (over 300 addresses) can be used to disseminate information about the project, the C.A.G., and Public Process and allow the community to contact the C.A.G., IDOT and Teng representatives if required.
- Public meeting announcements will be posted on the project website (www.galena-bypass.com)

Linking the project website (www.galena-bypass.com) from other, frequently visited websites such as the City of Galena (www.cityofgalena.org), the Galena Chamber of Commerce (www.galenachamber.com), JoDaviess County (www.jodaviess.org) and the Convention and Visitors Bureau (www.galena.org) was discussed. It was decided that only the City of Galena and JoDaviess County websites are appropriate websites within

which to request a link to the project website. IDOT and Teng will look into whether these links can be added.

Accordingly, the draft C.A.G. meeting minutes (for 2/7/2006) will be finalized and uploaded to the project website for viewing, both by C.A.G. members through the Forum (see below) and on the Public Involvement Activities page of Galena-Bypass.com.

3. Web Forum Demonstration and Discussion

Teng presented a demonstration showing the various screens and functions of the new C.A.G. Forum (www.galena-bypass.com/CAG_Forum). The forum is a tool which the C.A.G. members will use to communicate ideas with other members, IDOT, and Teng representatives, as well as to post topics, questions, and comments related to the Galena Bypass project. The forum will be available to C.A.G. members only and accessed via username and password accounts.

Teng will e-mail C.A.G. members their usernames and temporary passwords to access the website.

C.A.G. members James Boho, John C. Cox and Valerie Stabenow were asked to take a “test-drive” of the forum prior to Thursday’s meeting. Generally, these members stated that the forum was easy to use and effective.

C.A.G. members pointed out that free email account sites exist so members without e-mail or internet access at home could still utilize the forum using public computers, for example, those found at libraries.

Other comments on the functionality and screen items are as follows:

- On the C.A.G. forum homepage for Topics: “Views” are equivalent to “Hits”, in other words, how many times a particular topic has been viewed and/or read.
- Instead of *Phone 1* and *Phone 2* listed in the Member Profile, could there be something more specific, like a *home, cell, work icon or check box*? Teng will investigate on how this change could be implemented and/or improved. It would require that the C.A.G. members specify their primary and secondary phone numbers.
- Additional Topic Folders for forum could include: Profile, Interchanges, Public Meeting, Environmental, Aesthetics, Tourism, and others. Teng will add these types of Topics to the forum; however, it should be noted that forum discussion will not be constrained to these issues, and the ability to add new topics by C.A.G. members exists as a function found in the forum.

- Other items the C.A.G. wishes to see as part of the forum: C.A.G. meeting minutes, key dates (for future C.A.G. meeting & Public Meetings), location and time of next meeting.

4. U.S. 20 Profile / Horseshoe Mound Interchange / North IL-84 Interchange Presentation and Discussion

A. U.S. 20 Bypass Profile

Teng presented the reasons for refinement of the Galena Bypass Profile. Teng discussed why the Phase I profile was set higher and why the amount of fill was so great. With greater understanding of the area and subsurface, the profile can be lowered and refined.

Initial comments posted on the website questioned whether the profile could more closely follow the existing terrain. In the presentation, Teng reviewed profile design criteria, challenges of following the existing terrain, and reviewed the key areas and solutions Teng developed to minimize environmental impacts and construction limits as well as cost. Teng summarized the advantages of the refined profile, namely;

- Reduced construction footprint by 11.4 Acres
- Reduced woodland impact by 7.9 Acres
- Elimination of the need for borrows pits. 3.1 million cubic yards of fill material vs. 100 thousand cubic yards of excess material
- Reducing the earthwork cost by 33%, or \$22.7 million dollars

Questions regarding profile issues included the following:

C.A.G. members requested a comparison to existing roads that are 7% slopes within the area. IDOT identified that there are steep slopes (7%) along the existing U.S. 20 just west of the Galena Territory entrance as well as just east of downtown Galena. Members asked how these grades compared to the existing U.S. 20 expressway grades (from Galena to East Dubuque). IDOT is currently studying this portion of roadway for future improvements and would look into gathering information about the existing grades.

Members questioned how IDOT coordinated with local landowners regarding potential landlocked parcels. IDOT and C.A.G. members who participated in public coordination in Phase I for over 8 years stated that these types of issues were reviewed very thoroughly in the Phase I. The Phase I Citizens Advisory Board helped determine the best alignment, and the goals of the current refinements are to lessen impacts and costs. Parcels were reviewed in detail and access roads were identified where feasible. Long culverts were considered, however, the extent of the roadway footprint can be as much as 600 feet wide in some areas. The size of the structure, whether a bridge or culvert, necessary to allow farm implements to pass between

landlocked parcels was often found to make this option not cost effective. IDOT will purchase landlocked parcels.

Profile refinements reduce the overall footprint of the freeway, lessening overall impacts and providing increased opportunities for mitigation.

C.A.G. members thanked IDOT for providing a map of the bypass with cross-streets and nearby addresses at freeway alignment crossings. This allows members to investigate the location and obtain a visual perspective at Buckhill Road, Stagecoach Trail, and Council Hill Road. The proposed plan and profile sheets that were distributed earlier to C.A.G. members can be used in conjunction with this map to identify the proposed profile elevation compared to the existing terrain. The C.A.G. Forum could be used to post members' findings.

C.A.G. members asked about the amount of cuts and fills produced by the proposed profile and if the freeway would look like the current U.S. 20 from Galena to East Dubuque. There will be many cuts and fills along the profile, with upwards of 15 ft. of soil and 5ft. or more of rock cuts in certain areas. Ideally, fill material will be provided from the cut areas within the project, unless some of the material is found to be unsuitable for fill applications.

The discussions briefly touched on tourism and view. Both the Phase I and proposed profiles provide views of roof tops and steeples of Galena at the Stagecoach Trail Bridge for 20 to 18 seconds (respectively), traveling at 60 mph. It was noted that the view of Galena from the existing U.S. 20 at Horseshoe Mound is roughly 30 seconds. C.A.G. members suggested the installation of additional signage to satisfy tourism concerns as well as adding lookout areas along the freeway for increased viewing of Galena. IDOT and Teng will look into adding lookout areas where feasible.

Lastly on the topic of the U.S. 20 Bypass Profile, the C.A.G. requested a show of hands to identify if there was a consensus on the design of the proposed profile, as presented by Teng/IDOT. The results for this consensus vote were 18 for "yes" and 0 for "no". Consensus on the design of the U.S. 20 Bypass Profile was therefore reached.

B. Horseshoe Mound Interchange

Teng presented the various design configurations studied for the Horseshoe Mound Interchange location along with basis for choosing the proposed design.

In summary, three (3) interchange configurations were presented:

- ½ Diamond
- ½ Cloverleaf
- Trumpet (proposed design)

Due to traffic capacity and functionality constraints the ½ Diamond configuration was found to be unreasonable.

Due to environmental constraints (substantial encroachment into Horseshoe Mound), the ½ Cloverleaf configuration was not feasible.

The Trumpet interchange offered functionality, safety, as well as minimal right of way and environmental impacts (none to Horseshoe Mound) and was shown to be the preferred configuration.

Comments regarding the Horseshoe Mound Interchange included the following:

For the Trumpet interchange, group members questioned how eastbound traffic will enter the proposed U.S. 20 freeway. A left turn lane providing adequate storage capacity would handle the traffic demands originating from Galena and entering the Galena Bypass northbound.

C.A.G. members asked if the Trumpet interchange provided adequate capacity for traffic flow, particularly on the ramp from southbound U.S. 20 to eastbound existing U.S. 20. IDOT and Teng responded noting that the ramp capacity for this movement is 2000 vehicles/hour, more than double the projected amount of 900 vehicles/hour. The interchange will be designed to handle the year 2028 traffic flow.

There were general comments suggesting the construction of the new bridge and proposed alignment for existing U.S. 20. Teng showed how the future bridge would be offset from the U.S. 20/IL-84 existing alignment for ease of construction. (Please refer to the last paragraph of (C.) below)

C. North IL-84 Interchange

Teng presented the various design configurations studied for the North IL-84 Interchange location along with basis for choosing the proposed design.

In summary, three (3) interchange configurations were presented:

- Cloverleaf
- SPUI (Single Point Urban Interchange)
- Diamond (proposed design, as presented in the Phase I Environmental Impact Study)

Due to increased right of way and land impacts in the south half of the interchange, as well as additional costs, the Cloverleaf configuration was not recommended.

The SPUI design offered limited benefits in lower right of way impacts, but there would be no reduction in earthwork and limited environmental benefits at this location (compared to Horseshoe Mound). Any minor benefits do not justify the increased costs needed for the complex bridge and retaining wall design. The SPUI configuration was not recommended.

The Diamond interchange proposed during Phase I design offers familiarity, functionality, low right of way impacts and lowest overall cost. The Diamond interchange is therefore the proposed interchange type.

Comments regarding the North IL-84 Interchange included the following:

C.A.G. members inquired about the capacity and Level of Service (LOS) for the Diamond configuration. Teng identified that the LOS is "A/B" for projected traffic. After the meeting, the LOS for this interchange was found to be "B/C", as listed in the Phase I IDS. LOS of "A/B" was indicated for the *Horseshoe Mound Interchange*. However, an LOS of B/C is still considered to represent a good range of operating conditions.

In consideration of the amount of time already spent discussing the previous agenda items, and the need to address the remaining agenda items, it was determined that further Interchange discussions and potential consensus must be postponed until next month's C.A.G. meeting. Members can continue submitting questions and discussions through the C.A.G. website Forum. Teng and IDOT will review these comments and questions and try to respond to them at the next C.A.G. meeting.

5. Membership Formalization / Leadership

The formalization of the membership of the group was discussed. It was agreed that the membership of the group is now closed, and will be defined as those in attendance at this meeting, as well as John Blum and Ralph Winklehake who responded in advance that they could not attend the meeting. Going forward, any other additional meeting attendees will act as Observers or Specialists.

During previous C.A.G. meetings, the current C.A.G. Facilitator, James Boho, indicated that it was not necessarily his intention to become the permanent leader and spokesperson for the C.A.G. Mr. Boho briefly summarized his responsibilities as C.A.G. Facilitator as well as his recent interactions with IDOT and Teng. Other C.A.G. members recognized Mr. Boho's work and dedication to the role.

Mr. Boho indicated his willingness to continue in a leadership role. C.A.G. member Robert J. Johnson offered to be co-Facilitator and assist Mr. Boho throughout future C.A.G. meetings and discussions. All C.A.G. members accepted the offers of both gentlemen as leaders of the group.

6. Mission Statement / Future Topics

The C.A.G. briefly discussed the need for a mission statement and that it should be defined before the time of the first Public Meeting. The group also briefly discussed other topic possibilities. The group agreed to use the Forum as the vehicle to discuss the mission statement as well as other future topics. C.A.G. member Valerie Stabenow suggested that Teng add a website Forum Topic Folder titled Mission Statement as a way to help formulate this idea. Another folder will be added for Public Meeting Suggestions.

7. Meeting Recap / Next Meeting

The following meeting recap items were reviewed and will be discussed as items on the next C.A.G. meeting agenda:

- Interchanges
- Mission Statement
- Public Meeting

C.A.G. Member Conduct

- In order to hear all opinions, C.A.G. members will make only one comment at a time, allowing opportunity for other members to speak.
- Questions should be specific to the topic being discussed at that moment. Questions pertaining to other topics should be held until an appropriate time is available or during “open discussion” portions of the meeting.

Next C.A.G. Meeting

- The next C.A.G. meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 4, 2006. The location for this meeting is currently unavailable. C.A.G. members will be notified in a timely manner once this location is finalized.

The foregoing is the writer’s understanding of the matters discussed and the conclusions reached in summary form. This will become part of the project record and is the basis upon which we will proceed. Concurrence on these meeting minutes will be requested at the April 2006 C.A.G. meeting.

Very truly yours,

TENG & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Robert J. Stankiewicz, P.E.
Project Engineer